

### **REMARKS**

This response is submitted in reply to the outstanding Office Action dated December 23, 2008. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's examination of the application as evidenced by the Office Action. All claims pending at the time of examination (i.e., claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-28, 30, 31, 35, and 39-42) currently stand rejected.

The Office Action rejects claims 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action also indicates that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25-28, 30, 31, 35, and 39-42 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,183, hereinafter "Satran") in view of Stapleton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,875, hereinafter "Stapleton"), further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,285 hereinafter Lee). Claims 8, 9, 23, and 24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satran in view of Stapleton and Lee, and in further in view of Haggerty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,983, hereinafter "Haggerty").

As explained below, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from cited references, taken individually or in any proper combination. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended various ones of the claims, including pending independent claims 1, 6, 15, 21, and 39-42 to further clarify the claimed invention. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

#### **Claims 39-42 are Supported by the Specification**

As stated above, the Office Action rejects claims 39-42 for failing to comply with the written description requirement since the claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of

the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action indicates with respect to claims 39-42, the following. "Providing transmission of individualized data packets to the individual addresses of the receivers is not found in the specification. The specification only discloses transmitting packets to the receivers themselves, not to individual addresses within the receivers." (Office Action, Page 2)

Applicants submit that the Office Action misconstrues the language of the claims as introducing "individual addresses contained within the receivers." To the contrary, the claim language indicates, consistent with the Office Action's assertion of the content of the specification, that the claims are referring to the receiver addresses, and not "individual addresses contained within the receivers." For clarity, Applicants have nonetheless amended claims 39-42 to reference "individual receiver addresses." As such, the rejection of claims 39-42 for failing to comply with the written description requirement is overcome.

**Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25-28, 30, 31, 35, 39-42 are Patentable**

As stated above, the Office Action rejects all the claims as being obvious in view of Satran, Stapleton, and Lee, or in view of Satran, Stapleton, Lee and Haggarty. According to one aspect of the claimed invention, independent claim 1, and similarly independent claims 15, 39, and 40, recites, *inter alia*, "filtering, in the routing unit, the multicast data packets in accordance with the specific parameters for respective receivers of the multicast group to obtain filtered multicast data packets individualized for the respective receivers; and transmitting, by the routing unit, the individualized filtered multicast data packets to the addresses of the respective receivers." Similarly, independent claim 6, and similarly independent claims 21, 41, and 42, recites, *inter alia*, "filtering, in the routing unit, the addresses of the receiver list in accordance with the specific parameters to obtain filtered receiver addresses, the filtered receiver addresses being a subset of the receiver addresses included in the multicast group; and transmitting, by the routing unit, the multicast data packets to respective addresses included in the filtered receiver addresses." The language of the independent claims clarifies that the

results of the filtering operations (e.g., data packets individualized for the respective receivers) are individually addressed and transmitted to appropriate receivers.

To assist in understanding an example embodiment of the invention, Applicants draw attention to Page 10, Lines 14-19 of the International Publication WO 01/19029, where the present application states “[f]or example, when the routing means 2 receives multicast data packets from the sender 1 it supplies modified multicast data packets to receiver 4a, no multicast data packets to the receiver 4b, i.e., the address of the receiver 4b is filtered out, and unchanged multicast data packets to the receiver 4c.” As such, the routing means can take differing actions with respect to individual receivers based on receiver-specific parameters. A multicast data packet is therefore modified, or in some cases eliminated, based on receiver-specific parameters, and the resultant receiver-specific data packets are then separately forwarded to the respective receivers using receiver-specific addressing, rather than multicast addressing.

The Office Action relies upon the disclosure of Satran as support for the obviousness rejections of the pending independent claims. However, neither Satran, nor a combination of Satran with any of cited references, teaches or suggests the transmission of individually addressed packets as claimed.

In this regard, Satran describes a multicast packet-switched system where packets are transmitted from a plurality of transmitters, multiplexed, and then transmitted as multicast addressed packets to a multicast group of receivers. As a result, the same data packets are received by all members of the multicast group in Satran. Any filtering of the multicast addressed packets is performed at the receivers after receipt of the multicast addressed packets. (Col. 5, Lines 26-27). Satran expressly states, “[m]ulticast group address filtering is accomplished in the receiver...” (Col. 5, Lines 26-27) As such, the packets of Satran are generated as multicast addressed packets at a multiplexer and transmitted as multicast packets to the multicast group. Therefore, unlike the claimed invention, all members of the multicast group receive the same data packets addressed to the entire multicast group, rather than individually addressed data packets that have possibly been individualized for each of the receivers.

Further, even the filtering that is performed after receipt of the data packet, continues to be directed to multicast group addressing, rather than receiver-specific addressing. Satran uses

an address masking scheme to identify whether a data packet is directed to a multicast group. Satran states this expressly in Col. 5, Lines 39-43 that “[m]asking on all the bits of the Address Field 228 allows a receiver to search for a *particular multicast address*, while masking off all of the bits in the address field would have the effect of the receiver accepting *all multicast addresses*.” (Emphasis Added) In sum, Satran even after performing the masking of the address field, still operates at the multicast addressing level, rather than using receiver-specific addressing.

In addition to the distinctions described above with respect to the independent claims, additional patentable features are recited in the dependent claims, such as dependent claims 2-4, 7, 10, 12, 16-18, 31, and 35. These and other claims are directed to the filtering of *the content* of the multicast data packets, such as advertisement content. Satran is again cited for allegedly disclosing these features. However, Satran merely describes the use of the masking of addresses, not content, to “filter out unwanted data packets.” (Col. 4, Lines 53-54) As such, Satran fails to teach or suggest to the features associated with the filtering of content included in claims 2-4, 7, 10, 12, 16-18, 31, and 35.

As a result, the claimed elements are not taught or suggested by Satran, or Satran in combination with the cited references, and therefore the claimed features would not provide a predictable result based on the disclosure of Satran, or a combination of Satran with any of the cited references.

As such, Applicants assert that the rejections of independent claims 1, 6, 15, 21, 39, 40, 41, and 42 for being obvious are overcome and the claims are in condition for allowance, based at least on the remarks provided above. Since dependant claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, and 31 include all the recitations of their respective independent claims, as well as additional features, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections of the dependent claims are also overcome and the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

Appl. No.: 10/049,590  
Amdt. Dated 05/26/2009  
Reply to Office Action of 12/23/2009

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Quirk  
Registration No. 60,676

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111  
LEGAL02/31025874v1

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON May 26, 2009.**